

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 7, 11-13, 19, 20, 23, 24, 32, 35, 37, 45-49, 55, 56, 59, 60, 68, 71, 73, 76-80, 83, 84, and 86-88, 37, 74 and 86-88 have been amended. Claims 5 and 8-10 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, and 11-88 are pending in the application. Claims 6, 7, 11-13, 19, 20, 23, 24, 32, 35, 45-49, 55, 56, 59, 60, 68, 71, 76-80, 83, 84 and 86-88 were amended for proper antecedent basis. The specification has also been amended for consistency and for better form. These claim and specification amendments are supported by the application as originally filed and do not present new matter.

I. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 1-88 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,724,575 to Hoover et al. ("the Hoover patent"). Claims 5 and 8-10 were canceled without prejudice. Accordingly, the rejection of currently pending claims 1-4, 6, 7, and 11-88 is addressed. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, however, in order to expedite prosecution of the application, the Applicants offer amendments to independent claims 1, 37, and 73 and the following remarks.

The Applicants' application generally describes a de-centralized client-server database system in which distributed databases having different data structures can be efficiently searched in parallel or "simultaneously" using data processing system 112 components. The data processing system components are executed between a client computer and a server computer. In other words, the data processing system 112 is "incorporated into the various databases" of the client and server computers. (See, Figure 1 (illustrating distributed system 112 components); p.4, lines 4-5 (comparing conventional systems); p. 7, line 10 (geographically distributed data stores); p. 7, lines 21-27 (data processing system 112 is executed between the client and server computers); p. 7, line 30 (simultaneous searching across multiple, heterogeneous data sets); p. 20, lines 26-27 (data processing system 112 generates inverted tables), p. 21, lines 14-15 (data processing system 112 performs join operations); p. 29, line 30 – p. 30, line 8; p. 37, lines 5-11, 19-24 (data processing system can search single database, multiple databases, different databases of same server, different databases of different servers; widespread simultaneous searching of multiple, distributed databases)).

With this de-centralized or distributed framework, the data processing system 112 of the subject application can be used to search all or several collections at the same time. (See, p. 26, lines 5-11). If the data processing system 112 attempts to open multiple collections, some of which have different standard preferences, these differences are reconciled by selecting the most common preferred standard. (See, p. 26, lines 25-27). With this configuration, the meaning of collection fields can be interpreted across collections such that the query with different field classifications will retrieve all of the necessary data using the metadata standards and all of the requested objects that satisfy the search criteria can be identified and displayed. (See, p. 29, lines 5-27; p. 30, lines 24-27; p. 32, lines 22-24).

Consequently, the data processing system components 112 do not reside on, and are not executed by, a centralized server or broker. As a result, data formats can be reconciled directly between client and servers using the distributed data processing system 112 rather than having to direct all data management and processing through a central broker.

Amended independent claim 1 of the subject application refers to a de-centralized data processing system having at least one client computer and a plurality of server computers, the de-centralized data processing system being executable between the client computer and the plurality of server computers. Claim 1 continues to recite steps and further recites that at least one of the above steps is executed in a server computer and at least one of the above steps is executed in a client computer. These amendments are supported by the specification as originally filed, as discussed above. Independent claims 37 and 73 have also been amended to include similar "de-centralized" processing limitations.

The Hoover patent, in contrast, is specifically directed to a system that uses a centralized object broker 20. (See, Hoover patent, Figs. 1, 2 and 6 (Central Object Broker 20); col. 1, lines 15 ("centralized object broker"); col. 4, lines 42-44; col. 21, line 15; col. 21, line 15 ("Central Computer or 'Object Broker'")). Correspondingly, the Hoover patent does not disclose or suggest the "de-centralized system" limitations of independent claims 1, 37 and 73 and their respective dependent claims, all of which incorporate the elements and limitations of respective independent claims 1, 37 and 73. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

The Applicants further respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 37 and 73 and all of their respective dependent claims are not obvious in view of the Hoover patent. In fact, the Hoover patent specifically distinguishes and, teaches away from, a de-centralized system as recited in the amended claims. For example, the Hoover patent explains "[i]t is therefore apparent that the literature teaches away from the use of a centralized server for purposes of object management." (Hoover patent, col. 4, lines 42-44 (emphasis added)). Accordingly, there clearly is no suggestion or motivation to modify the centralized server system described in the Hoover patent to derive the process and systems recited in Applicants' claims, all of which refer to a de-centralized system.

II. CONCLUSION.

Based on the forgoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If there are any remaining issues that can be resolved by telephone, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BINGHAM McCUTCHEN, LLP

Dated: March 24, 2004

By: 

Gary D. Lueck
Reg. No. 50,791
Attorneys for Applicants

Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1800
San Francisco, California 94111-4067
Telephone: (213) 680-6400
Facsimile: (213) 680-6499